

Interview Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/006,790	MASUDA ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Jeanne A. Di Grazio	2871	

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

- (1) Jeanne A. Di Grazio. (3) (pre-approved by Robert Kim, SPE).
 (2) Nicholas Seckel. (4) _____.

Date of Interview: 02 July 2003.

Type: a) ☐ Telephonic b) ☐ Video Conference
 c) ☒ Personal [copy given to: 1) ☐ applicant 2) ☒ applicant's representative]

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) ☐ Yes e) ☒ No.
 If Yes, brief description: _____.

Claim(s) discussed: All.

Identification of prior art discussed: Yamaoka, Arimoto, and Isamu.

Agreement with respect to the claims f) ☐ was reached. g) ☒ was not reached. h) ☐ N/A.

Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: Possibly will submit an affidavit from inventors showing results not expected and not obvious and why the prior art did not suggest invention. Will get back to inventors for their input.

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN ONE MONTH FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE, OR THE MAILING DATE OF THIS INTERVIEW SUMMARY FORM, WHICHEVER IS LATER, TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached sheet.

Examiner Note: You must sign this form unless it is an Attachment to a signed Office action.

 Examiner's signature, if required

Intervi w Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/006,790	MASUDA ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Jeanne A. Di Grazio	2871	

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

(1) Jeanne A. Di Grazio.

(3) (pre-approved by Robert Kim, SPE).

(2) Nicholas Seckel.

(4) _____.

Date of Interview: 02 July 2003.

Type: a) ☐ Telephonic b) ☐ Video Conference
c) ☒ Personal [copy given to: 1) ☐ applicant 2) ☒ applicant's representative]

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) ☐ Yes e) ☒ No.
If Yes, brief description: _____.

Claim(s) discussed: All.

Identification of prior art discussed: Yamaoka, Arimoto, Isamu

Agreement with respect to the claims f) ☐ was reached. g) ☒ was not reached. h) ☐ N/A.

Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: (below)

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN ONE MONTH FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE, OR THE MAILING DATE OF THIS INTERVIEW SUMMARY FORM, WHICHEVER IS LATER, TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached sheet.

Affidavit from inventors showing results not expected and not obvious, and why the prior art did not suggest invention. Will get back to inventors for their input.*

** Attorney will possibly submit an affidavit.*

Examiner Note: You must sign this form unless it is an Attachment to a signed Office action.

Jeanne Di Grazio
Examiner's signature, if required